



**Robert J. Canfield, Examiner**  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

**August 29, 2006**

Glenn R. Rouse  
P.O. Box 2122  
Traverse City, Mi. 49685  
Email: [au149@tcnet.org](mailto:au149@tcnet.org)  
Ph: 231-313-0051

(re: Pat. Ap.# 10/623,787)

**Dear Mr. Canfield,**

How are you? I hope you received my last submission -- a two-page letter with enclosures:

1. "Preferred Species" (1 page)
2. "Selected Claims" (2 pages)
3. Synopsis of Patent Application (9 pages)
4. The "Family" (graphic rep. -- 1 page)

If you did not receive this business envelope of 15-pages, please let me know. It was all dated August 13, 2006.

As it turned out -- at 7-minutes to the 5pm deadline on Oct. 14 -- my attorney, **Mr. Cheslek**, sent me an email to tell me that he had renegged on sending the response to your July 12th "communication"; a response that he and Partner Callaghan had worked on for two weeks. Instead they filed for a one-month extension. I guess you know this. I'm not yet sure what caused the sudden logjam.

I have since revealed to Partner **Terry Callaghan** that I had mailed to you a packet of things in response to your communication of July 12th. He will soon be going over a facsimile of all the enclosures (above) that I had sent to you. I have also sent him a copy of the **reformed letter** of the 2-page letter I had composed to you on August 13th -- this is an edited down version of that original; edited down to the main business at hand, and put on a single sheet (here enclosed). Some meaningful changes have been perpetrated in the section I've boxed. **Mr. Callaghan** will not be getting a copy of the 2-page original.

I hope I have not caused anymore confusion by sending you this dispatch... but for sure I had to let you know that my attorney(s) is now privy to the same information that you have, and hopefully he/they may now be able to orchestrate some sort of answer to your communication of July 12th... and of which I will have a chance to ponder before it heads your way.

And I am personally sorry about these delays.

*My best to you in everything,  
Thank you for hearing me out,*



↑  
ENCLOSURES

Robert J. Canfield, Examiner  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313

Reformed letter of: Aug. 13, 2006  
(a copy and enclosures also sent to Att. Callaghan)

P.O. Box 2122  
Traverse City, Mi. 49685  
Email: au149@tcnet.org

(re: Pat. Ap.# 10/623,787)

Dear Mr. Canfield,

I'm the inventor of the "Radial-hinge Mechanism" and for the record: I know more about this invention than anyone, and more about its '*Patent Application*' and its Claims. My original attorney, Michael Long, and I, carefully composed the disclosure and my insistence on thoroughness resulted in this multileveled '*Application*'.

I now enclose a review of "preferred species" as you had required in your July 12 "Communication", though also keeping in mind that *Mechanism 400* is a 12-spoke *Radial-hinge Mechanism*, chosen as the key performer in the '*Patent Application*', but mainly to make the task of rendering this unique geometric device on CAD manageable (Ref. also to paragraph 0126 in Pat.Ap.).

But, also, In Figs. 17-26, I spotlight a 16-spoke mechanism for construction purposes, though also wherein whereby I divulge the unique formula of construction that makes all versions of this mechanism members of the same family, i.e. same species.

Thus, *Mechanism 400* (starting in Fig. 4) is "preferred" only by virtue of its abundance in the Figures for illustrative purposes. And I include its designation# in the enclosed set of Claims only as a reference to orient the claims with the *Figures* and help to define what's generic.

As to the whole set of Claims 1-61...

Originally designed upon the criteria of presenting two independent claims #1 & #31 to cover the multitude of embodiments this geometrical device can pose as; with a third independent #61 to cover one specific version of the mechanism (possibly an expendable claim):

Claim# 1: from the premise of identifying the family of mechanisms construed from a set of spokes of equal length.

Claim# 31: from the premise of identifying the family of mechanisms construed from elongate crossmembers with no mention of their lengths being equal (until later in dependent claim# 37).

Claim#61: with the intent to exclusively protect a 16-spoke version of *Radial-hinge Mechanism* and all its niceties (although a single significant error in this Claim# 61 identifies the mechanism as having "five arcs per chord" and that should read as "seven arcs per chord" and thereby identifying that second most prevalent version of the mechanism in the *Figures* -- developed throughout Figs. 17-26, resulting in the design 2600, and seen as a 16-spoke truncated version of the *Radial-hinge mechanism* in Fig. 16. I'm sorry you were not informed of this error; and I didn't press for the change because there is as well a 16-spoke mechanism at five arcs per chord in Fig. 15).

To give you a better handle on the '*Application*', I also enclose a nine-page "synopsis" of the '*Application*', wherein I **highlight** references to the invention's unique character of being a "family" of mechanisms. I also enclose a graphic, illustrating a portion of this "family".

I am sorry if this correspondence represents some sort of interference or impropriety. All in all, the intent here is to give you a better understanding of the item at hand... nothing more.

Cordially,

In addition, I have small prototypes available for scrutiny if ever you wish to observe and handle one or another version of this thing called a *Radial-hinge Mechanism*.

**Enclosures:**

**August 13, 2006**

1. "Preferred Species" (1 page)
2. "Selected Claims" (2 pages)
3. Synopsis of Patent Application (9 pages)
4. The "Family" (graphic rep. -- 1 page)